

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,475	01/28/2004	Dean E. Meyer	MDG-006CIP	5070
49055 7590	06/15/2006		EXAMINER	
DANIEL J. DENEUFBOURG		LARSON, JUSTIN MATTHEW		
109 WOODSTOCK AVENUE SUITE 100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLARENDON HILLS, IL 60514			3727	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			6			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/767,475	MEYER, DEAN E.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
T. W.	Justin M. Larson	3727				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a repl will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH t, cause the application to become ABAN	TION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Ja	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 January 2004</u> .					
, <u> </u>	· —					
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10,12-15 and 17-28</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>11,16,29 and 30</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objection of a complex accepted or b) \square objection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in App rity documents have been re u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/1/04.		fail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3727

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-6, 19, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-6, it is unclear whether Applicant is attempting to claim the subcombination of the clip alone, or the combination of the clip and the article. Claim 1 recites only a clip with functional language implying the clip's use with an article, while claims 2-4 set forth specific structure of the article.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the pack" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the rearward lateral movement" in lines 2-3.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "the weight supported member" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Swetish (US 6,199,732 B1).

Swetish discloses a clip (20) adapted for use in connection with an article (14) intended to be carried by a user, the article defining a shell and interior (26), the clip

Art Unit: 3727

defining a body (34) and a pair of rigid spaced-apart arms (40&42) that protrude generally outwardly from a pair of apertures in the shell while the body is located within the shell (col. 3 line 65), the arms being adapted to rest and exert a compressive force against the waist or hips of the user (col. 5 line 60), wherein the arms can be flexed (i.e. bent at the joint) towards and away from each other and are also collapsible (when removed from ball sockets), and wherein a strap (110) extends between and interconnects the arms (via member 70) for pivotal movement with respect to each other. Regarding claim 20, Sweitsh discloses one material for the arms (which form part of the clip) being plastic, Examiner is of the position that plastic is generally a mixture, thus an alloy, of plasticizers, fillers, pigments, and other additives, and that plastic are generally known to retain their original shape after being bent or flexed.

4. Claims 7, 12, 13, 21-25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lamar (US 5,419,473 A).

Lamar discloses a golf bag having an outer surface and a handle (80), the golf bag adapted to be carried by a user and comprising a support member, or clip, (60) suspended from the handle and defining a pair of spaced-apart arms (70) adapted to rest against the waist and/or hips of the user, wherein the arms of the clip can be placed adjacent the outer surface of the golf bag or wrapped around the waist and/or hips of the user, fastened together by a strap (72). Regarding claim 25, the arms are adapted to be buckled around the waist of a user at which point they apply a force against the waist of the user. Regarding claim 28, the arms (70) are defined by the material layer or frame of support member (60). No structure has been set forth to define the frame such

Art Unit: 3727

that the layer of material that surrounds support member (60) can be considered the claimed frame.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamar as applied in paragraph #4 above in view of Opsal (US 4,479,595).

Lamar discloses the claimed invention but fails to specify how the support member is formed, such as a frame member surrounded by a sleeve. While Lamar is silent to the structure of the support member (60), Examiner notes that such support members or waist belts are typically formed from a layer of semi-rigidmaterial (frame) surrounded by a fabric cover (sleeve). Opsal discloses such a waist-belt or support member (5) and teaches that the support member is formed of a semi-rigid frame (18) that is surrounded by a sleeve (5). Opsal teaches that this semi-rigid frame member functions to stiffen the belt and help distribute the load from the user's back to a greater length along around the belt (col. 3 lines 43-49). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the support member of Lamar out of a semi-rigid frame member surrounded by a sleeve, as taught by Opsal, in order to better distribute the load of the golf bag along the length of the belt.

6. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swetish as applied in paragraph#3 above in view of Lamar (US 5,419,473 A).

Swetish discloses the claimed invention except the pack (14) is in the form of a general backpack and not specifically a golf bag as claimed. Lamar teaches a similar load support system in which a golf bag is taught as being supported by a pair of

Art Unit: 3727

shoulder straps and a waist belt in the same manner as taught by Swetish. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the support system of Swetish to carry a golf bag in the manner as taught by Lamar since both inventions are directed to like support systems for supporting packtype carriers on a user's back.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamar (US 5,419,473 A) as applied in paragraph #4 above in view of Feldman, Jr. (us 6,182,874 B1).

Lamar discloses the claimed invention but is silent as to the material structure of the arms (70) of the waist-belt. Feldman, Jr., however, also discloses a support system for carrying a golf bag and teaches that the arms of the waist belt include a layer of dense foam in order to prevent the belt from curling (col. 9 line 5). In other words, when a user attempted to curl the waist-belt, upon release, the belt would assume its original shape. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a layer of dense foam in the arms of Lamar, as taught by Feldman, Jr., since such a construction for golf bag waist supports is old and well known in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/767,475 Page 6

Art Unit: 3727

Claims 11, 16, 29, and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin M. Larson whose telephone number is (571) 272-8649. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Friday, 8am 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on (571) 272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 3727

Page 7

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JML 6/12/06 MATHAN J. NEWHOUSE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER